



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It was urged that the legislation was in conflict with the power of Congress to regulate inter-state commerce, but as the corporation was a domestic one, operating within the State, it was held that the statutes affected the product before it had become a subject of inter-state commerce. It was also urged that inasmuch as the use of harmless coloring matter was permitted in the case of natural butter, but denied in the case of artificial butter, there was a denial of the equal protection of the laws, and a taking of property without due process of law. But it was held that as the state court had decided that this was not for the purpose of discriminating in favor of butter, but only to provide a means by which the public might distinguish between natural and artificial butter, the legislation must be deemed valid. "It cannot in reason be said," declared the supreme court, "as a mere matter of judicial inference, that such regulations for such purpose were a mere arbitrary interference with rights of property, denying the equal protection of the laws, or that they amounted to a taking of property without due process of law." *Powell v. Pennsylvania*, 127 U. S. 678, and *Plumley v. Massachusetts*, 155 U. S. 461, were held to be conclusive of the questions presented.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—FAILURE TO LEAVE SUBJACENT SUPPORT IN MINING—WHEN STATUTE BEGINS TO RUN.—The supreme court of Pennsylvania had occasion, in a late case, to pass upon the vexed question as to the time when the statute of limitations begins to run, where there has been a failure to leave sufficient supports to maintain the surface—whether from the time the mineral is removed, or from the time when the surface subsides. The court held that the statute begins to run from the former date, so that in the case at bar there could be no recovery where there had been no subsidence until after the statutory period had expired, *Noonan v. Pardee*, 200 Pa. 474, 50 Atl. Rep. 255 (1901), 55 L.R.A. 410. The court cited several English cases, including *Backhouse v. Bonomi*, 9 H. L. Cas. 503, but declared that the cases in England were so conflicting that the law could not be considered as settled there. Curiously enough, however, it failed to cite (though the briefs show it had its attention drawn to) the leading and important case of *Darley Main Colliery Co. v. Mitchell*, 11 App. Cas. 127, (Mechem's Cases on Damages, 117,) wherein the House of Lords fully considered the question and came to the opposite conclusion.